



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/994,635	11/28/2001	Alan H. Karp	10010485-2	7721

7590 08/19/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

SERRAO, RANODHI N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/994,635

Applicant(s)

KARP ET AL.

Examiner

Ranodhi Serrao

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6 and 8-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6 and 8-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Examiner Tan Lien is no longer assigned to the present patent application. This application is now assigned to Examiner Ranodhi Serrao. In examining this patent application, full faith and credit has been given to the search and action of the previous examiner. MPEP § 719.05.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 6 May 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued in substance the amended claims: 1, 6, 8, 14, 19, and 26. However, these limitations are taught by the previously cited references. (See below).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 14-20 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ankireddipally et al. (US Patent 6,772,216).

5. As per claim 14, Ankireddipally et al. teaches a computer comprising: a conversation controller generated from a description file, said conversation controller being operable to perform a sequence of interactions described in said description file, and said sequence of interactions includes at least one of receiving messages and transmitting messages (col. 11, line 56-col. 12, line 21: wherein transaction service serves the function of a conversation controller, and col. 17, line 62-col. 18, line 9 and col. 12, lines 32-48).
6. As per claims 15 and 16, Ankireddipally et al. teaches a computer program as claimed, wherein at least one interaction of said plurality of interactions is configured to select one message to be received or transmitted from a set of messages, said set of messages being included in said plurality of messages (see Ankireddipally et al., col. 8 lines 25-42; wherein depending on the interaction, the interaction protocol is configured to select a request-reply, publish-subscribe, or broadcast-multicast application-to-application message type structured in XML document format).
7. As per claim 17, Ankireddipally et al. teaches a computer program as claimed, wherein said at least one transition includes a source interaction of said plurality of interactions and a destination interaction of said plurality of interactions, said source interaction being executed prior to said destination interaction (FIG. 6; wherein the source interaction is the Request message and the destination interaction is the Reply message and acknowledgements).
8. As per claim 18, Ankireddipally et al. teaches a computer program as claimed, wherein said at least one transition includes a triggering message of said plurality of

Art Unit: 2141

messages, said triggering message invoking execution of said source interaction (col. 7 lines 45-52; wherein the request message triggers a reply message in predetermined manner).

9. As per claim 19, Ankireddipally et al. teaches a computer comprising; a web service, said computer configured to communicate with another computer based on a plurality of interactions described in a description file (col. 11, lines 24-40), said plurality of interactions describing messages at least one of a message type to be received (col. 13, line 61-col. 14, line 12) and a message type to be transmitted to said another computer to facilitate said web service (col. 15, lines 39-57), wherein the message type to be received or the message type to be transmitted includes attributes describing data in a message that corresponds to the message type (col. 15, line 58-col. 16, line 9).

10. As per claim 20, Ankireddipally et al. teaches a computer readable medium on which is embedded a computer program, the computer program comprising: a plurality of interactions describing a plurality of messages to be received and/or transmitted (Abstract and col. 6 lines 49-67), and at least one transition identifying the order of executing said plurality of interactions (Abstract and col. 7 lines 1-10).

11. As per claim 26, Ankireddipally et al. teaches a computer, wherein said message type to be received or transmitted comprises of an XML document (col. 20, lines 28-41).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2141

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 1-4, 6, 8, and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ankireddipally et al. (US Patent 6,772,216) and DeLong (US Patent 6,247,169).

14. As per claim 1, Ankireddipally teaches a plurality of interactions describing a plurality of messages to be received and/or transmitted (see Ankireddipally, abstract and col. 6 lines 49-67); and at least one transition identifying the order of executing said plurality of interactions (see Ankireddipally, abstract and col. 7 lines 1-10), the at least one transition including a source interaction of said plurality of interactions and a destination interaction of said plurality of interactions, said source interaction being executed prior to said destination interaction (see Ankireddipally, FIG. 6; wherein the source interaction is the Request message and the destination interaction is the Reply message and acknowledgements). But fails to teach a computer program wherein the at least one transitions is an exception transition, said destination interaction being executed when a message type that is not expected by said source interaction is received. However, DeLong teaches a computer program wherein the at least one transitions is an exception transition, said destination interaction being executed when a message type that is not expected by said source interaction is received (see DeLong, col. 8, lines 1-49). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ankireddipally's computer program with DeLong's software steps

Art Unit: 2141

of handling exceptions and defaults, for the advantage of improving paradigm for managing program flow control (see DeLong, abstract).

15. As per claims 2-4, 6, 8, and 9-13, the above-mentioned motivation of claim 1 applies fully in order to combine Ankireddipally et al. and DeLong.

16. As per claim 2, Ankireddipally et al. and DeLong teach a computer readable medium on which is embedded a computer program, the computer program comprising: a plurality of interactions describing a plurality of messages to be received and/or transmitted (see Ankireddipally et al., Abstract and col. 6 lines 49-67), And at least one transition identifying the order of executing said plurality of interactions (see Ankireddipally et al., Abstract and col. 7 lines 1-10).

17. As per claims 3 and 4, Ankireddipally et al. and DeLong teach the computer program as claimed, wherein at least one interaction of said plurality of interactions is configured to select one message to be received or transmitted from a set of messages, said set of messages being included in said plurality of messages (see Ankireddipally et al., col. 8 lines 25-42; wherein depending on the interaction, the interaction protocol is configured to select a request-reply, publish-subscribe, or broadcast-multicast application-to-application message type structured in XML document format).

18. As per claim 6, Ankireddipally et al. and DeLong teach the computer program as claimed, wherein said at least one transition includes a triggering message of said plurality of messages, said triggering message invoking execution of said source interaction (see Ankireddipally et al., col. 7 lines 45-52; wherein the request message triggers a reply message in predetermined manner).

19. As per claim 8, Ankireddipally et al. and DeLong teach a computer program wherein said at least one transition includes a default transition (see Ankireddipally et al., col. 14, line 43-col. 15, line 11: wherein a standard interface and a standard model serve the function of a default transition), said source interaction being executed when a message included in said source interaction that does not otherwise have a defined transition is received (see Ankireddipally et al., col. 20, lines 9-24).

20. As per claims 9, 10, and 11, Ankireddipally et al. and DeLong teach the computer program as claimed, wherein said plurality of interactions describe a plurality of message type in the form of XML schemas for said plurality of messages (col. 5, lines 55-60; XML schemas are well known in the art at the time of the invention).

21. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ankireddipally et al. (US Patent 6,772,216) and DeLong (US Patent 6,247,169) as applied to claims 1 and 9-11 above, and further in view of Andrew Layman ("XML Schema NG Guide", Microsoft, May 1999), hereinafter referred to as Layman.

22. As per claim 12 and 13, Ankireddipally et al. and DeLong teach the mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 9-11 above but fail to teach said plurality of interactions include a location or a unique name for said XML schema wherein the location or the unique name includes a URL or URN. However, Layman, in an analogous art, teaches a location in the form of a URN for the XML schema (page 3 of 23, under "Types and Elements"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ankireddipally's and DeLong's computer program with

Art Unit: 2141

Layman's XML Schema to include the URN location, for the advantages of adding capabilities and flexibilities in XML (see Layman, page 1 of 23; Introduction).

23. Claims 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ankireddipally et al. (US Patent 6,772,216) and DeLong (US Patent 6,247,169) as applied to claims 19 and 20 above, and further in view of Andrew Layman ("XML Schema NG Guide", Microsoft, May 1999). Ankireddipally teaches the computer as claimed, and suggested a internal and external registries to store XML schema but fails to explicitly state that said computer is connected to a registry storing a plurality of description files associated with a plurality of web services so that another computer can retrieve the description files containing at least one transitions and identified by a URN. However, Layman, in an analogous art, explicitly teaches a central registry identified by a URN storing a plurality of description files (XML schemas stored in an external location) so that other web service users can use them (page 3 of 23, under "Types and Elements"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ankireddipally's computer program with Layman's central registry for storing XML schemas, for the advantages of adding capabilities and flexibilities in XML (page 1 of 23; Introduction).

Conclusion

24. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2141

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

25. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ranodhi Serrao whose telephone number is (571)272-7967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571)272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you

Art Unit: 2141

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



RUPAL DHARIA
PATENT EXAMINER